

1 Rena Andoh (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
2 randoh@sheppardmullin.com.com  
3 **SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER**  
4 & HAMPTON LLP  
5 30 Rockefeller Plaza  
6 New York, NY 10112  
7 Telephone: (212) 653-8700

8 Lai L. Yip (SBN 258029)  
9 lyip@sheppardmullin.com  
10 Four Embarcadero Center, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
11 San Francisco, CA 94111  
12 Telephone: (415) 434-9100

13 Travis J. Anderson (SBN 265540)  
14 tanderson@sheppardmullin.com  
15 12275 El Camino Real, Suite 100  
16 San Diego, CA 92130  
17 Telephone: (858) 720-8900

18 Kazim A. Naqvi (SBN 300438)  
19 knaqvi@sheppardmullin.com  
20 1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1600  
21 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
22 Telephone: (310) 228-3700

23 Attorneys for Plaintiff and  
24 Counterdefendant MOOG INC.

25 Rachel L. Fiset (SBN 240828)  
26 rachel.Fiset@zfzlaw.com  
27 Scott D. Tenley (SBN 298911)  
28 scott.Tenley@zfzlaw.com  
**ZWEIBACK FISET &**  
**ZALDUENDO LLP**  
315 W. 9th Street, Suite 1200  
Los Angeles, California 90015  
Telephone: (213) 266-5170

31 Attorneys for Defendant ROBERT  
32 ALIN PILKINGTON

33 Douglas E. Lumish (SBN 183863)  
34 doug.lumish@lw.com  
35 Gabriel S. Gross (SBN 254672)  
36 gabe.gross@lw.com  
37 Arman Zahoory (SBN 306421)  
38 arman.zahoory@lw.com  
39 Ryan T. Banks (SBN 318171)  
40 ryan.banks@lw.com  
**LATHAM & WATKINS LLP**  
41 140 Scott Drive  
42 Menlo Park, CA 94025  
43 Telephone: (650) 328-4600  
44 Facsimile: (650) 463-2600

45 Attorneys for Defendant and  
46 Counterclaimant SKYRYSE, INC.

47 Grant B. Gelberg (SBN 229454)  
48 grant.Gelberg@halpernmay.com  
49 Kevin H. Scott (SBN 274605)  
50 kevin.Scott@halpernmay.com  
51 Alyssa L. Titche (SBN 313296)  
52 alyssa.Titche@halpernmay.com  
53 Catherine Thompson (SBN 313391)  
54 catherine.Thompson@halpernmay.com  
**HALPERN MAY YBARRA &**  
**GELBERG LLP**  
55 550 South Hope Street, Suite 2330  
56 Los Angeles, California 90071  
57 Telephone: (213) 402-1900

58 Attorneys for Defendant MISOOK  
59 KIM

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

MOOG INC.,

Plaintiff,

V.

SKYRYSE, INC., ROBERT  
ALIN PILKINGTON, MISOOK  
KIM, and DOES NOS. 1-50,

## Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-09094-GW-MAR

*Hon. George H. Wu*

**JOINT STIPULATION REGARDING  
DEADLINE FOR MOOG'S MOTION  
FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMENDED  
COMPLAINT, AND DEFENDANTS'  
RESPONSES THERETO**

Complaint Filed: March 7, 2022  
Counterclaims Filed: January 30, 2023

1 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between Plaintiff and  
2 Counterdefendant Moog Inc. (“Moog”), Defendant and Counterclaimant Skyryse,  
3 Inc. (“Skyryse”), Defendant Robert Alin Pilkington (“Pilkington”), and Defendant  
4 Misook Kim (“Kim”) (Kim and Pilkington are collectively referred to as the  
5 “Individual Defendants”) (Moog, Skyryse, and the Individual Defendants are  
6 collectively referred to as the “Parties”) through their respective attorneys of record,  
7 as follows:

8 WHEREAS, on March 7, 2022, Moog commenced this action with the filing  
9 of its Complaint (Dkt. 1);

10 WHEREAS, on May 31, 2022, the Individual Defendants filed a Motion to  
11 Dismiss Moog’s Complaint under Rule 12(b)(6), seeking dismissal of Moog’s  
12 causes of action for Tortious Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage,  
13 Unjust Enrichment, and Civil Conspiracy;

14 WHEREAS, on January 30, 2023, Skyryse served its Answer to Moog’s  
15 Complaint, along with Affirmative Defenses and Counterclaims (Dkt. 348);

16 WHEREAS, on February 21, 2023, Moog filed a Motion to Dismiss all nine  
17 of Skyryse’s Counterclaims under Rule 12(b)(2), (3) and (6) (Dkt. 360);

18 WHEREAS, on April 13, 2023, the hearing took place on the Individual  
19 Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss portions of Moog’s Complaint and Moog’s Motion  
20 to Dismiss Skyryse’s Counterclaims in their entirety;

21 WHEREAS, on April 14, 2023, the Court issued its final ruling regarding the  
22 Individual Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss portions of Moog’s Complaint and  
23 Moog’s Motion to Dismiss Skyryse’s Counterclaims in their entirety (Dkt. 439) (the  
24 “MTD Order”). Therein, the Court granted-in-part and denied-in-part the Individual  
25 Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss Moog’s Complaint, dismissing Moog’s causes of  
26 action against the Individual Defendants for Tortious Interference with Prospective  
27 Economic Advantage and Unjust Enrichment, with leave to amend. The Court  
28

1 granted-in-part and denied-in-part Moog's Motion to Dismiss Skyryse's  
 2 Counterclaims, dismissing all or portions of Skyryse's counterclaims for Breach of  
 3 Contract, Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing, Breach  
 4 of Implied Contract, Fraud/Misrepresentation, Tortious Interference with  
 5 Contractual Relationship, Intentional Interference with Existing Business  
 6 Relationships, Intentional Interference with Prospective Business Advantage, and  
 7 Unfair Business Practices in Violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, with leave  
 8 to amend;

9 WHEREAS, the Rule 26 Scheduling Conference was scheduled for April 20,  
 10 2023 at 8:30 a.m., and the Parties filed their Joint Rule 26(f) Report on April 17,  
 11 2023 (Dkt. 441);

12 WHEREAS, on April 19, 2023, the Court issued a Scheduling Order and took  
 13 the Rule 26 Scheduling Conference off calendar (Dkt. 446). The Scheduling Order  
 14 provides, in relevant part: "Given the Court's ruling on Defendants' motion to  
 15 dismiss, the plaintiff is given until May 10, 2023 to file an amended pleading and  
 16 Defendants shall respond by May 31, 2023. Thereafter, any further amendments  
 17 must be made by motion under Rule 16";

18 WHEREAS, Moog planned to advise the Court during the Rule 26 Scheduling  
 19 Conference that it intends to amend its Complaint beyond the limited scope of the  
 20 Court's MTD Order, including to potentially add new claims and/or parties to the  
 21 case, and to conform to the facts and evidenced obtained since the filing of Moog's  
 22 initial Complaint more than one year ago;

23 WHEREAS, to promote judicial economy for the Court and all Parties, Moog  
 24 desires to file a single Amended Complaint, rather than filing an Amended  
 25 Complaint solely in response to the limited leave granted in the Court's MTD Order,  
 26 and then simultaneously or subsequently filing a Motion for Leave to File an  
 27 Amended Complaint afterwards;

1           WHEREAS, because it intends to amend its Complaint beyond the limited  
2 scope of the Court's MTD Order, Moog desires an additional 10 days from the  
3 deadline in the Court's Scheduling Order to file its Motion for Leave to File an  
4 Amended Complaint;

5           WHEREAS, in connection with any forthcoming Motion for Leave to File an  
6 Amended Complaint, Moog would meet and confer with Defendants as required  
7 under the Local Rules to determine if any resolution can be reached;

8           WHEREAS, the Parties agree that Defendants would have 21 days to respond  
9 to any Amended Complaint filed by Moog, including any amended counterclaims  
10 responsive to the Court's MTD Order, with the 21 day period commencing upon the  
11 later of: 1) the Court's ruling on Moog's forthcoming Motion for Leave to File an  
12 Amended Complaint; or 2) the entry of any Amended Complaint filed by Moog.<sup>1</sup>

13           NOW THEREFORE, subject to the Court's approval, the Parties stipulate  
14 and agree as follows:

- 15           1.       In lieu of an Amended Complaint filed by May 10, 2023 solely in  
16 response to the limited leave granted in the Court's MTD Order,  
17 Moog may file on or before May 20, 2023 a Motion for Leave to File  
18 an Amended Complaint by which Moog can seek to add additional  
19 claims or parties to this lawsuit, unless the Parties stipulate (subject to  
20 the Court's approval) on or prior to that date that Moog may file the  
21 Amended Complaint, in which case Moog would file an Amended  
22 Complaint instead of a Motion for Leave to Amend;
- 23           2.       Defendants may oppose Moog's forthcoming Motion for Leave to  
24 File an Amended Complaint in the ordinary course and under the  
25 procedures set forth under the Local Rules;
- 26           3.       Defendants' deadline to respond to any Amended Complaint filed by

---

27  
28           <sup>1</sup> This stipulation is made without prejudice to Defendants' ability to seek leave for  
additional time to respond to Moog's Amended Complaint.

1 Moog (including Skyryse's deadline to file any Amended  
2 Counterclaims), is 21 days from the later of: a) the Court's ruling on  
3 Moog's forthcoming Motion for Leave to File an Amended  
4 Complaint; or b) the entry of any Amended Complaint filed by Moog.  
5

6 **IT IS SO STIPULATED.**

7  
8 Dated: April 27, 2023  
9

10 SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER &  
11 HAMPTON LLP

12 By: /s/ Kazim A. Naqvi  
13 Kazim A. Naqvi  
14 Counsel for Plaintiff and Counterdefendant  
15 Moog Inc.

16 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

17 By: /s/ Gabriel S. Gross  
18 Gabriel S. Gross  
19 Counsel for Defendant and Counterclaimant  
20 Skyryse, Inc.

21 ZWEIBACK FISET & ZALDUENDO LLP

22 By: /s/ Scott D. Tenley  
23 Scott D. Tenley  
24 Counsel for Defendant Robert Alin  
25 Pilkington

26 HALPERN MAY YBARRA & GELBERG  
27 LLP

28 By: /s/ Grant B. Gelberg  
29 Grant B. Gelberg  
30 Counsel for Defendant Misook Kim

## ATTESTATION

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5-4.3.4, I, Kazim A. Naqvi, attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained by all its signatories.

Dated: April 27, 2023

/s/ Kazim A. Naqvi